A SPEECH OF THE EMPEROR HADRIAN

An inscription from Tibur, known only from four slightly divergent copies of the sixteenth century, contains a large fragment of a speech given by Hadrian for his mother-in-law Matidia.[1] The credit for recognizing both speaker and subject belongs to Mommsen in an article of 1863, reprinted with further annotation by Otto Hirschfeld in 1905. In the first, longer part of his article Mommsen edited the text that he called the *Laudatio Turiae*. His identification of the subject as the Turia known from Appian (*BCiv*. 4.44) and Valerius Maximus (6.7.2) was disproved by the discovery of a further fragment, as Hirschfeld, among others, pointed out.[2] Mommsen's treatment of the second speech, however, and in particular his characterization of it as a funeral oration, have only rarely been questioned.[3] Nevertheless, it rested in part on an assumption that was similarly to be disproved by new discoveries, and moreover the text itself has not been revised since the late nineteenth century. In the following I have given a new text, a translation, a discussion of details, and finally some general considerations, which particularly concern the nature and occasion of the speech.

TEXT

The fact that ends of lines coincide either with complete words or with words divided according to rule (for example, *aman*[*tissima?*] in 4, *con*[*tubernalis*] in 8) strongly suggests that when the copies were made the stone was complete on the right. This was clearly Mommsen's inference, though he does not say if he also inferred it from the layout of the copies. He also seems to have assumed a line of about forty-five to fifty-five letters, and I have usually kept within those limits in making my own suggestions.

Fr. Vollmer, in his still fundamental study of Roman funeral orations,[4] gave a text for which he assumed a line ten or more letters longer, but the result was almost always padding. Thus in line 7, *uenit ad auunculum post adeptum principatum* (Mommsen), *uenit ad auunculum breui post*, and so on (Vollmer); in line 8, *ultimam ualetudinem* (Mommsen), *grauissimam et extremam ualetudinem* (Vollmer); in line 9, *contubernalis eum secuta est* (Mommsen), *contubernalis adsidua eum secuta est* (Vollmer). Nonetheless, Vollmer's text contains a number of valuable supplements, little regarded by subsequent editors, and I have made considerable use of them. In proposing a new text

[1] Th. Mommsen, 'Zwei Sepulcralreden aus der Zeit Augusts und Hadrians', in O. Hirschfeld (ed.), *Gesammelte Schriften* 1 (Berlin, 1905), 393–428 (originally *Abh. Akad. Wiss. Berlin* [1863], 455–89; only 422–8 concern the speech of Hadrian); H. Dessau, CIL 14 (1887), 3579; Fr. Vollmer, *Laudationum funebrium Romanorum historia et reliquarum editio*, *Jahrbücher für Philologie*, Suppl. 18 (1892), 516–25; L. Cantarelli, 'Gli Scritti latini di Adriano imperatore', *Studi e documenti di storia e diritto* 19 (1898), 119–33. The editions of I. Mancini, *Inscriptiones Italiae* 4.1 (1952), 77, and E. M. Smallwood, *Documents of Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian* (Cambridge, 1966), 114 add little to Mommsen. References of the form 'M 367' refer to the second edition of the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani* by E. Groag, A. Stein, and others (Vienna, 1933–). Other abbreviations should be self-explanatory. I am very grateful to Dr Barbara Levick for comments and to the students in my seminar on Hadrian (Harvard, Spring Term 2003).

[2] On this question, see Dessau's note, ILS 2.2, p. 928.

[3] For the usual view, see e.g. A. R. Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor* (London, 1997), 107.

[4] Vollmer (n. 1).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I have preferred to give a continuous and readable one, even at the risk of appearing to restore too freely.

1 [-]tate
2 [-]bativa
3 [-]entissimus fui
4 [-]mam socrum aman-
5 [ ] sibique saluam Sabinae meae
6 [ ] matri meae facerem *vac*
7 [auunculum post adeptum pri]ncipatum ac deinceps usque ad illam
8 [nouissimam ualetu]dinem qua diem suum obiit comes et con-
9 [tubernalis secuta est,] uerendo ut filia, comitate nulla non fa-
10 [ciens pro eo, nec umquam sine illo] uisa est *vac*
11 [Sed quid plura dicam de] moribus socrus meae? Nam qui potuit effici
12 [ ] feminae grauitatem ferret omnino ne
13 [ ] summe probaret. *vac*
14 [-------- et sin]gillatim de uirtutibus eius omnia quae
15 [sentirem eloquere]r si non ita uictus essem praesenti confusione.
16 [Nunc autem facer]e uelim et dicere tantum quae possim, indig-
17 [natus non aliud posse quod] aut laudibus eius dignum aut dolori meo
18 [satis sit. Nam adhuc] est imago tristissima socrus optimae labentis
19 [ante oculos, aure]is etiamnum strepunt luctuosis conclamatio-
20 [nibus propinquar]um mearum. *vac*
21 [Quare dolorem ani]mi mei subleuate, et ea quae pulchre scitis de mo-
22 [ribus eius ment]ote, si potius ut nota dicentur quam ut noua.
23 [Vixit marit]o carissima, post eum longissimo uiduuio in eximio flo-
24 [re aetatis et] summa pulchritudine formae castissima, matri suae
25 [obsequ]entissima, ipsa mater indulgentissima, cognata piis-
26 [sima, omnes iuu]ans, nulli grauis, nemini tristis, iam quod ad me atti-
27 [net, ante cura singu]lari, post tanta modestia uti nihil umquam a me pe-
28 [tierit cre]braque non petierit quae peti maluissem. Inter meas
29 [spes summa]e uoluntatis, plurimis et longissimis uotis precata, talem
30 [me qualem optauera]t uidit. Gaudere fortuna mea maluit quam frui.
31 [Diui patris mei nept]em sanguine, adoptione in consobrinae
32 [locum mihi constitutam,] Augustae filiam et diuae, avun-
33 [cul- -]tum decus pro meritis hones-
34 [tum consecrationis hono]re dignemini rogo
35 [uol]untate adversus
36 [ ] in re tali
37 [-]ucereue

APPARATUS[5]

7. [*auunculum post adeptum pri*]*ncipatum* J.; [*uenit ad auunculum*] etc. M.
8. [*nouissimam ualetu*]*dinem* J.: [*ultimam u.*] M.
9. *con*[*tubernalis secuta est*] M.
9–10. *fa*[*ciens pro eo*] J.; *fa*[*mulando*] V.

[5] I have abbreviated the names J(ones), M(ommsen), and V(ollmer). Conjectures of S. Dehner and A. A. F. Rudorff are cited from Vollmer.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

10. [*nec umquam sine illo*] *uisa est* M.; [*sola eius salute ga*]*uisa est* V.
11. [*Sed quid plura dicam de*] J.
14. [*placide* (e.g.) et *si*]*ngillatim* J. (*[si]ngillatim* also V.)
15. [*sentirem eloquere*]*r* J. ([*eloquere*]*r* also Dehner)
15–16. [*nunc autem facer*]*e uelim et dicere tantum quae possim, indig*[*natus*] J.; [*ut non possim dicere qua*]*e …. indig*[*narer*] V.
16–17. [*non aliud posse quod*] *aut laudibus eius dignum aut dolori meo* [*satis sit*] J.; [*cum non occurrat quod*]. . . . [*sit compar*] V.
17–18. [*nam adhuc*] *est imago tristissima socrus optimae labentis* [*ante oculos*] J.; [*ob oculos*] *est imago,* with further comma after *labentis,* V.
18. [*aure*]*is* or [*aur*]*is* J.; [*aures neni*]*is* V.
20. [*propinquar*]*um* Rudorff
21. [*Quare dolorem ani*]*mi mei subleuate* J. ([*ani*]*mi* also Rudorff)
22. *de mo*[*ribus eius mement*]*ote*, J. (*mement*]*ote* also V.)
23. [*Vixit marit*]*o* J. (*marit*]*o* also M.); [*Vixit uiuo marit*]*o* V.
23–4. *flo*[*re aetatis et*] M.; *flo*[*re iuventutis et*] V.
25. [*obsequ*]*entissima* M.
25–6. *piis*[*sima, omnes iuu*]*ans* M.; [*am*]*ans* Rudorff
27. [*ante cura singu*]*lari* J.; [*prius merito singu*]*lari* V.
28. *pe*[*tierit cre*]*braque* Rudorff; *pe*[*tierit suo usui cre*]*braque* V.
29. [*spes summa*]*e* J.; [*uices optima*]*e* V.
30. [*qualem optauera*]*t* J.; [*qualem mihi optauit statum, ut uidi*]*t* V.
31. [*Diui patris mei nept*]*em* M. (but see Constitution of the Text).
32. [*locum mihi constitutam*] M.
33. [*consecrationis hono*]*re* J.
35. [*uol*]*untate* V.
37. [*d*]*ucere ue* Dehner.

TRANSLATION

I have put restored words in square brackets.

Lines 7–10. [She followed her uncle] from [his obtaining] the position of emperor, and right up to that [last illness] by which he met his death, as his companion and intimate, revering him like a daughter, in her affection doing everything [for him, and] was [never] seen [without him].

Lines 11–20. [But why should I say more] about the character of my mother-in-law? For how could it come about [that . . .] gravity of [----] woman at all, [and not?] . . . approve most highly? I would describe [calmly and?] and in detail all that [I felt?] if I were not so very overcome by my present grief. [As it is, however,] I would wish [to do] and say only what I am able, regretting [that I cannot do something else that should be] either worthy of her praises or [adequate] for my sorrow. [For still] there is the most grievous image of my mother-in-law declining [before my eyes, my] ears are even now echoing with the lamentations of my [women relatives].

Lines 21–33. Therefore relieve my mind's [grief], and [remember] what you know very well about [her] character, even if what is said will be known rather than new. [She lived] as one most dear to her husband, after him most chaste through a very long widowhood (despite being) in the prime of her life and with the greatest physical beauty, most obedient to her mother, herself a most indulgent mother, a most dutiful relative, [helping all], gloomy towards none, and as far as I myself am concerned,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[previously (she was, sc.) of] extraordinary concern, (and) later of such great modesty that she never asked anything of me, and did not ask for many things which I would rather have wished to be asked for. Of the [highest] goodwill amid my [hopes], after offering very many and very prolonged prayers, she saw [me] such as she had prayed. She preferred to rejoice in my station rather than to make use of it. [As the niece of my deified father] by blood, by adoption [placed in the relation] of cousin [to me], . . . uncle . . . a noble title in accordance with her merits, I ask that you confer upon her the [honour of consecration] . . .

CONSTITUTION OF THE TEXT

7. Mommsen proposed [*uenit ad auunculum post adeptum pri*]*ncipatum,* but at sixty letters this is too long. I have therefore assumed that *auunculum* is the first word of the sentence and is governed by the verb in 9, possibly (as Mommsen suggested) *secuta est*.

8. Mommsen's *ultimam* would produce a line of only forty-four letters, and I have substituted *nouissimam*.

9–10. Possibly *comitate nulla non fa*[*ciens* or *faciendo pro eo*] (*fa*[*mulando*] Vollmer). In 10, I have adopted Mommsen's [*nec umquam sine illo*] *uisa est,* though Vollmer's [*sola eius salute ga*]*uisa est* is also attractive.

11–13. *Nam qui potuit* clearly begins a new sentence, preceded by a statement or a question such as [*Sed quid plura dicam de*] *moribus*. In the second sentence, *qui* should be adverbial or instrumental (*OLD qui*[2]), 'for how could it be brought about that . . .'. No obvious restoration comes to mind, but it would not need to exceed a limit of fifty-five letters, for example *ut* [*nemo male imperatoriae*] *feminae grauitatem ferret omnino, ne*[*ue aliter quam*] *summe probaret*.

14–15. Again, what precedes [*si*]*ngillatim* cannot be certainly restored, but could be another adverb: the *OLD* cites *singillatim et placide* from Plautus, *discretim ac singillatim* from Apuleius. In line 15, the first R looks like the last letter of a deponent subjunctive, for example *quae* / [*sentirem eloquere*]*r si non ita uictus essem praesenti confusione*. The *ita* is presumably absolute, 'so very', though it might introduce a consequence clause.

16–18. My restoration assumes that a new sentence begins in line 16, and that the first E is the last letter of an active infinitive. Vollmer places *ob oculos* before *est imago,* perhaps rightly. For *labor* in an absolute sense, 'sinking', *TLL* 7.2, 782.75ff., citing this passage.

19. The plural noun governing *strepunt* should be *aures*, as in Livy 22.14.8 (speech of the Master of Horse Minucius Rufus), *strepunt aures clamoribus plorantium sociorum.* Vollmer proposed [*aures neni*]*is strepunt,* but the IS may rather represent the archaic spellings *auris* or *aureis*.[6] If that is right, it follows that Hadrian's archaism extended to matters of Latin orthography.

20. Roughly fifteen letters should be missing to the left, to judge by the length of the lacunae in 18 and 19. The sense clearly requires mention of the women of Hadrian's house, and the simplest restoration is Rudorff's [*propinqua*]*rum mearum.* These 'womenfolk' would have included Hadrian's sister Domitia Paulina (D 186), his wife Vibia Sabina, and Sabina's half-sister, the daughter of Matidia known as the Younger Matidia (M 368).

[6] Dessau, ILS 3.2, 849; M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre* (Munich, 1977), 440, sect. 357 C3, Zusatz.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

21–2. The sense of the missing parts, if not the exact wording, seems easily restored; Vollmer assumes the same syntax, and he too supplied [*memento*]*te*. The appeal to the audience's knowledge of Matidia recalls Velleius Paterculus on Livia, 'whose power no one felt except by a lessening of their danger or an increase in their dignity', *cuius potentiam nemo sensit nisi aut leuatione periculi aut accessione dignitatis*. If the audience is the senate, as will be argued below, then the *senatus consultum de Gnaeo Pisone* provides a closer parallel: 'Though she (Livia, sc.) should rightly and properly have the greatest influence in making requests of the senate, she used it most sparingly', *cum iure meritoq(ue) plurumum posse in eo quod a senatu petere<t> deberet, parcissume uteretur eo*.[7]

22. It does not seem possible to take *si* otherwise than as concessive. This sense is not rare, though it is usually softened by a *tamen* or other adversative in the main clause.[8]

27. Only ten or fifteen letters should be missing between *atti*[*net*] and -]*lari post tanta modestia*. Vollmer proposed [*prius merito singu*]*lari, post tanta modestia,* which is only slightly too long. With *ante* for *prius* and *cura* (*OLD* s.v. 5, 'solicitude, concern') in place of *merito* it would fit more easily, and with these changes I have adopted it here.

28. Vollmer's [*cre*]*braque* is tempting; assuming an E misread as B, I had thought of [*pl*]*eraque.* The syntax will have to be very compressed, with *maluissem* establishing a contrast not between what Matidia did request and what she did not (since Hadrian has just said that she asked for nothing), but between her unwillingness to ask for 'very many things' and his willingness to grant them if she had asked. A somewhat similar idea is cited by Cassius Dio from a speech of Hadrian on Plotina, which again may be one requesting her deification rather than a funeral oration, 'Though she asked much of me, she was never refused anything.' Dio glosses this as: 'Her requests were of such a character that they neither burdened me nor afforded me any justification for opposing them.'[9]

28–30. Vollmer's suggestion for the lacuna in line 29, *Inter meas* [*uices optuma*]*e uoluntatis,* is attractive, but at sixty letters is rather long. The substitution of *spes* for *uices* seems an obvious improvement, and with *summae* instead of *optimae* can just fit (the mason might also have increased the number of letters per line as he approached the end of the stone). Thereafter Vollmer's [*qualem mihi optabat statum, u*]*t uidit*, is clumsy, but can be reduced by assuming that *talem* refers to Hadrian himself, *talem* [*me qualem optauera*]*t uidit*.

31. I have followed Mommsen in restoring [*Diui patris mei nept*]*em sanguine,* though Matidia was only Trajan's niece through her mother. She was, however, the direct descendant of Trajan's father, and another inscription calls the Younger Matidia *divi Traiani abneptis*, where the elder Trajan must be meant. In the present one it is therefore worth thinking of *diui aui* rather than *diui patris*.[10]

34. For [*consecrationis hono*]*re* see below.

[7] Vell. Pat. 2.130.5; W. Eck, A. Caballos, and F. Fernández. *Das Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre* (Munich, 1996), 46, lines 117–18 (with a slightly different text).

[8] J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1972), 671–2, section 370. Cf. [Quint.] *Decl*. 265, 11, *si iuncta sunt ista, duas causas habent*, with Winterbottom's note; the *OLD* s.v. *si* 9 cites the imperial-period rhetor Calpurnius Flaccus (ed. G. Lehnert, p. 5), *Decl*. 4, *hanc crucem patere, si grauis est.*

[9] Cass. Dio 69.10.3a, trans. E. Cary.

[10] Inscription: CIL 3.5807. For a stemma, Birley (n. 3), 308. I owe this point to Dr Levick.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Matidia (M 367), often called the Elder Matidia, was Trajan's niece and at the same time Hadrian's mother-in-law, the mother of his wife Vibia Sabina. The Acts of the Arval Brethren, in a fragment discovered in 1868, show that she died in December 119, and that the College sent a gift of perfumes to be used for her 'consecration', though strictly that term applied to the senatorial act making her a *diua*: *in consecra*[*tionem M*]*atidiae Aug(ustae), socrus Imp(eratoris) Caesaris Traiani Hadriani Aug(usti), unguenti p(ondo) II nomine collegi fratr*[*um Aruali*]*um per C. Vitorium Hosidium Getam mag(istrum) missum; turis p(ondo) L item nomine calator*[*um*].[11] The *Life of Hadrian* in the Historia Augusta twice mentions gifts made by the emperor to the people in her posthumous honour: *socrui suae honores praecipuos impendit ludis gladiatoriis ceterisque officiis; Romae post ceteras immensissimas uoluptates in honorem socrus suae aromatica populo donauit* (9.9; 19.5).

These celebrations would certainly have involved a speech given by Hadrian at his mother-in-law's cremation, and Mommsen assumed without argument that the present text represented that speech. In an almost forgotten study, L. Cantarelli took issue with his hypothesis.[12] Agreeing that Hadrian gave the speech in honour of Matidia, he argued that the occasion was not her funeral but a later event. Specifically, the people of Tibur had voted to consecrate a statue to the late Augusta, and asked Hadrian to deliver a speech at the inauguration, perhaps in 120. This speech they then inscribed on the base of the statue, and indeed one of the authorities for the text affirms that it was carved on a statue-base. Cantarelli's hypothesis was too elaborate to win many adherents,[13] but one of his arguments carries weight. It would be slightly odd for Hadrian to say that 'his ears were even now echoing' (line 19) with the mourning for Matidia if he was speaking at her funeral; that phrase suggests the passage of some time.

Mommsen gave no explicit reason for excluding a meeting of the senate as the occasion of the present speech, but his reason can be inferred. Discussing Matidia's consecration, he says: '[Matidia] starb vor Hadrian and wurde von ihm mit Leichenspielen und sonst hoch geehrt. Aber consecrirt wurde sie nicht von ihm, sondern wie es scheint erst geraume Zeit nach ihrem Tode von Antoninus Pius.'[14] Even in 1863, however, as one of Mommsen's footnotes showed, there was evidence that Hadrian had consecrated Matidia; and only five years after his study there came to light the fragment of the Acts of the Arval Brethren proving that she died in December 119. Coins usually attributed to Hadrian's reign have the legend *Diva Matidia Augusta* on the obverse, and on the reverse types such as *Consecratio*, with an eagle with wings outspread, or *Pietas Augusta*, with Pietas sacrificing at an altar.[15]

As Mommsen himself was later to explain, the consecration of an emperor or a member of the imperial house required a resolution of the senate, the motion being

[11] Smallwood (n. 1), no. 7; J. Scheid, *Recherches archéologiques à la Magliana: Commentarii Fratrum Arvalium qui supersunt* (Rome, 1998), 210, no. 69, lines 5–7, with his commentary. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 13.2.3, *decreti et a senatu. . . . Claudio censorium funus et mox consecratio*, and see further below.

[12] Cantarelli (n. 1).

[13] In criticism of Cantarelli, H. Bardon, *Les empereurs et les lettres latines d'Auguste à Hadrien* (Paris, 1940), 402–3.

[14] Mommsen (n. 1), 426.

[15] H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum* 3 (London, 1966), 281, nos. 328–32.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

made by the ruler:[16] 'die Aufnahme. . . . eines abgeschiedenen Geistes, insonderheit derjenigen der verstorbenen Kaiser unter die oberen Götter des Staats erfolgt immer durch den Senat, jedoch auch in diesem Fall factisch durchaus, und vielleicht von Rechtswegen, nicht anders als auf Antrag des Kaisers.' In the present speech, Hadrian asks his hearers to lighten his grief, to remember Matidia's character (lines 21–2), and to think her worthy (*dignemini*, 34) of something presumably contained in a preceding ablative of the third declension. *Dignor* can have the nuance of 'to present someone with something deserved': thus the *OLD* cites Ov. *Met.* 1.194, where Jupiter says of the demi-mortals such as the Fauni *caeli nondum dignamur honore*. It is therefore at least as plausible a hypothesis as Mommsen's that the present speech is the one in which the emperor asked the senate to vote posthumous honours for Matidia, with [*consecrationis*] preceding [*hono*]*re.* The title of *diua* may then also be the *decus pro meritis hones*[*tum*] referred to in line 33.

The Arval Brethren sent their gift for Matidia's cremation on 23 December: the record refers to her 'consecration', though the true consecration, her recognition as *diua* by the senate, cannot have occurred so early. In the case of Augustus, nearly a month passed between his death on 19 August 14, and the senatorial act of consecration on 17 September.[17] That interval was probably exceptional, but it is reasonable to assume that a week or two passed between Matidia's death and the senate's vote: the session was perhaps that of 1 January 120. By that date Hadrian was in Rome, and had only recently had to make a similar request of the senate when still absent from the city. According to his biographer (HA *Hadrianus* 6.1), *Traiano diuinos honores datis ad senatum et quidem accuratissimis litteris postulauit et cunctis uolentibus meruit, ita ut senatus multa quae non Hadrianus postulauerat in honorem Traiani sponte decerneret*. By contrast, Antoninus Pius is said to have had the greatest difficulty in persuading the senate to consecrate Hadrian, and Cassius Dio even purports to quote his speech on the occasion, threatening not to accept the throne if the motion failed.[18]

Among imperial speeches to the senate inscribed elsewhere than in Rome, the best-known example is the bronze tablet from Lyon carrying Claudius' oration. The reasons for setting up the present copy at Tibur must remain speculative, but Cantarelli's suggestion that it was carved on a statue-base may be right. A base recently published from Misenum shows that a text of this length could be made to fit on such a base if the letters were small enough, and the letter-size of the present inscription is unknown.[19] Whatever its precise function, the stone might come from a family tomb, rather as the mausoleum of the Plautii at Tibur included an extract from Vespasian's speech to the senate conferring the *praefectura urbis* on Ti. Plautius Silvanus.[20] Hadrian's own villa is another possible site, since brickstamps have shown that its construction began at the very beginning of the reign, not (as used to be thought) towards its end.[21]

The various family relationships implied by the text are best discussed together. Matidia's father, C. Salonius Matidius Patruinus (M 365), had married Trajan's sister

[16] Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* 2 (Berlin, 1887[3]), 886, cf. 817, 833.

[17] For the latter date, see the Fasti cited in V. Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (Oxford, 1955[2]), 52. For the Arval record and its interpretation, see n. 11 above.

[18] Cass. Dio 70.1; cf. HA *Pius* 2.5.

[19] J. H. D'Arms, *JRS* 90 (2000), 135–6.

[20] ILS 986; *Inscr. Ital.* 4.1, 125; E. M. Smallwood, *Documents of Gaius Claudius and Nero* (Cambridge, 1967), 228.

[21] H. Bloch, *I bolli laterizi e la storia edilizia romana* (Rome, 1938), 173–4.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ulpia Marciana, so that the emperor was her maternal uncle (hence *neptem sanguine*, line 31). Matidia appears to have had two husbands, the first of whom is an otherwise unknown Mindius, the father of her daughter, the Younger Matidia (M 368); the fact that the inscription appears to mention only one husband ([*marit*]*o*, line 23) might suggest that this marriage ended in divorce. Her second husband was one L. Vibius Sabinus, perhaps consul in the year 97.[22] This marriage must have ended soon after that year, since Hadrian refers to her 'very long widowhood' (line 23), and says that she had been her uncle's companion since his becoming *princeps*, if Mommsen's supplement in line 7 is correct. If it is also correct that Matidia remained with Trajan all the time up to his death, that would help to explain her intimacy with Hadrian, who similarly accompanied the emperor in both Dacian Wars and again on his Parthian expedition. The Historia Augusta (*Hadrian* 5.9) mentions that Matidia helped to bring Trajan's ashes back to Rome, so that she presumably witnessed the mysterious transaction that produced the adoption of Hadrian.

Matidia's second marriage produced Vibia Sabina, whom Hadrian married in *c.* 101 (*socrum*, lines 4, 11, 18). Since his own father Hadrianus Afer (A 185) was a first cousin of Trajan, he himself was related to Matidia, but on his adoption as Trajan's son in 117 he became her first cousin (*consobrina*, line 31). For the probable mention of Hadrian's other 'womenfolk' in line 20, see above.

A final problem involves another small fragment from Tibur copied by Cyriacus, this too lost.[23] It refers to a 'wife' (*uxor*) and an 'image' (*simulacrum*), and a plural audience is addressed in the phrase *seruate mihi ius meum.* Dessau, followed by Cantarelli, assumed that it came from the same speech, though his arguments were contested by Vollmer, and it is not easy to see how the phrase 'Preserve my right' could fit a request for consecration.

Harvard University CHRISTOPHER P. JONES
cjones@fas.harvard.edu

[22] R. Syme, *Roman Papers* 1 (Oxford, 1979), 246 = *JRS* 43 (1953), 156; id., *Some Arval Brethren* (Oxford, 1980), 61 and n. 23.
[23] CIL 14.3579 a = *Inscr. Ital.* 4.1, 78. Vollmer (n. 1), 524–5.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.266 Published online by Cambridge University Press